

**REMARKS**

**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Concurrently with filing of the RCE, claims 15 and 16 have been amended. Claims 15 and 16 are now pending in this application. No new matter has been added.

**COIES OF INITIALED PTO-1449 REQUESTED**

As requested in the previous response, the appropriate initialed Form PTO-1449 in response to the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on January 19, 2006 has yet to be received. The Examiner is again requested to provide a copy of the initialed Form PTO-1449 as soon as possible.

**REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata (USPN 5,684,864) in view of Ozeki et al. (USPN 5,872,6410 and Ritzerfeld (USPN 4,129,073).

To expedite prosecution, independent claim 15 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*:

...

said output operation includes an operation of repeatedly printing a plurality of copies of an image data signal representing the entire document being received into a plurality of groups subsequent to the receipt of said identification signal on recording sheets, and

a number of copies repeatedly printed is pre-stored in the communication apparatus.

In Shibata, the number of copies repeatedly printed is not pre-stored in the communication apparatus, but is described in the codes that the PC transmits for specifying the printing method. Since the facsimile apparatus in Shibata is used as a printer of a PC, printing a plurality of copies on the facsimile apparatus is for the benefit of the user of the PC; i.e., the originating communication apparatus. Consequently, it is the user of the originating apparatus that specifies the number of copies. In contrast, in the present application, the fact that the facsimile apparatus on the receiving side prints a plurality of copies of received data is for the benefit of the user of the receiving facsimile apparatus. It is not possible for the user of the originating communication apparatus to know an appropriate number of copies to be made.

As to claim 16, the Examiner appears to interpret the word “bundle” as merely the meaning of “grouping”. Therefore, claim 16 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*:

...wherein a process of bundling each group of copies one by one with a staple is performed after said output operation.

Since the phrase “with a staple” has been added to claim 16, “a process of bundling of each group” now clearly means an operation of physically combining the sheets belonging to one group. Bundling sheets with a staple is not disclosed or suggested by Ritzerfeld.

In view of the above, the allowance of claims 15 and 16, as amended, is respectfully solicited.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Edward J. Wise (Reg. No. 34,523) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant